arXiv:1701.01085v2 [math.PR] 22 Jan 2017

DIFFUSION TRANSFORMATIONS, BLACK-SCHOLES EQUATION AND OPTIMAL STOPPING

UMUT ÇETIN

Abstract. We develop a new class of path transformations for one-dimensional diffusions that are tailored to alter their long-run behaviour from transient to recurrent or vice versa. Apart from their immediate application to the computation of distribution of first exit times, these transformations turn out to be instrumental in resolving the long-standing issue of non-uniqueness for the Black-Scholes equations in derivative pricing. Using an appropriate diffusion transformation we show that the Black-Scholes price is the unique solution of an *alternative* Cauchy problem. Finally, we use these path transformations to propose a unified framework for solving explicitly the optimal stopping problem for one-dimensional diffusions, which in particular is relevant for the pricing and the optimal exercise boundaries of perpetual American options.

1. Introduction

Conditioning the paths of a given Markov process, X, to stay in a certain subset of the path space is a well-studied subject which has become synonymous with the term h-transform. This paper proposes a new class of path transformations for one-dimensional regular diffusions with stochastic differential equation (SDE) representation. The new transformations are aimed at switching the behaviour of the diffusion from transient to recurrent or vice versa. We introduce the concept of *recurrent transformation* for transient diffusions in Section 3 and characterise these transforms via weak solutions of SDEs. Roughly speaking, a recurrent transformation adds a drift term to the original SDE of X so that the resulting process is a *recurrent* regular diffusion with the same state space whose law is locally absolutely continuous with respect to the original law. Although the recurrent transformation is at first sight meaningful only for transient diffusions, we note a special transform in Proposition 3.2 that is applicable not only to transient diffusions but also to recurrent ones. This transform, by adding again a certain drift, results in a *positively recurrent* diffusion. For example, this transformation turns a standard Brownian motion to a Brownian motion with alternating drift, which appears in the studies of the bang-bang control problem (see Example 3.1).

As a first application of the recurrent transformation, we compute in Corollary 3.1 the distribution of first exit time from an interval for a given diffusion. The formula does not provide an expression in closed form in general; however, a simple Monte Carlo algorithm will provide a sufficiently close estimate.

Although the distribution of first exit times has attracted the attention of researchers working on problems arising in the Monte Carlo simulation of stochastic processes, precise formulas for these distributions have rarely been the subject of a thorough investigation.

Date: January 24, 2017.

The recent paper of Karatzas and Ruf [20] seems to be the only work in the literature that addresses this problem. With an additional assumption on the local Hölder continuity of the coefficients of the SDE satisfied by X they have shown that the distribution function of the first exit time was the minimal nonnegative solution of a particular Cauchy problem. Our formula in Corollary 3.1 thus gives a representation for the minimal solutions of the class of Cauchy problems considered by Karatzas and Ruf.

Section 4 is devoted to the strong and weak limits of certain recurrent transforms when X is nonnegative and on natural scale. Under a mild condition on the diffusion coefficient of X we show that a particular sequence of recurrent transformations converges monotonically to the h-transform of X, where $h(x) = x$. We observe that the nature of this convergence depends crucially on whether X is a strict local martingale or not. In particular, we construct on a single probability space a sequence of recurrent transforms that increases a.s. to a diffusion that has the same law as the aforementioned h-transform. Yet we show that the limiting diffusion is not a weak limit of the sequence unless X is a true martingale by using a result of Blanchet and Ruf [5].

Our interest in local martingales in fact stems from the financial models with bubbles. If a financial model admits no arbitrage opportunities, the discounted stock price, X, must follow a local martingale under a so-called risk-neutral measure by the Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing [12]. When X is not a martingale but a strict local martingale, the stock price exhibits a bubble and many results in the arbitrage pricing theory become invalid (see [10] and [25] for some examples). One particular issue concerns the Black-Scholes pricing equation for a European option that pays the amount of $g(X_T)$ to its holder at time t. The arbitrage pricing theory suggests that the fair price of this option at time t is $v(T-t, X_t)$, where $v(t,x) := E^x[g(X_t)]$. Under mild conditions on g and X Ekström and Tysk [14] have shown that v satisfies the Cauchy problem

$$v_t = Av, \qquad v(0,\cdot) = g. \tag{1.1}$$

They have also shown that when the option is a call option, i.e. $g(x) = (x-K)^+$, or, more generally, when g is of linear growth, the above Cauchy problem does not have a unique solution. Bayraktar and Xing [3] have followed up this question by showing that the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem is determined by the martingale property of X. Later, Bayraktar et al. [2] have extended the scope of these conclusions to Markovian stochastic volatility models.

The absence of uniqueness for solutions of (1.1) is especially problematic if one wants to compute the option prices by solving (1.1) numerically. To resolve this issue we establish in Section 6 a new characterisation of the valuation function $(t,x) \mapsto E^x[g(X_t)]$ in terms of the unique solution of an alternative Cauchy problem. We show that this function, after an appropriate scaling, becomes the unique solution of

$$w_t = \tilde{A}w$$

with certain initial and boundary conditions, when $\tilde{A}$ is the generator of a suitable h-transform of X. More precisely, this h-transform coincides with the one that is obtained as the limit of recurrent transforms in Section 4. One interesting corollary of the main result of this section is that for any $t > 0$ the valuation function is of strictly sublinear growth at ∞

when g is of at most linear growth and the stock price is given by a strict local martingale. In particular, $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{E^x[X_t]}{x} = 0$ for any $t > 0$ if X is a strict local martingale.

While Section 6 is on the valuation of European options, Section 7 considers the pricing of perpetual American options. In order to price such an option with payoff g, one needs to solve the optimal stopping problem

$$\sup_{\tau} E^x \left[e^{-\lambda\tau} g(X_\tau) \right],$$

where $\lambda > 0$ corresponds to the constant interest rate.

Peskir and Shiryaev [26] give an excellent survey of available methods to tackle this problem. One approach to the above consists of solving a free boundary problem associated to the infinitesimal generator of X. Another approach is via the characterisation of λ-excessive functions of X as the value function for the optimal stopping problem is the least λ-excessive majorant of g. This is the path taken by Dayanik and Karatzas in [11]. More recently, Beibel and Lerche [4] have proposed a new methodology based on simple martingale arguments. While the approach based on the solution of a free boundary problem rarely provides explicit solutions, the other two have the potential to offer explicit or semi-explicit solutions provided that one has the solutions of a family of Sturm-Liouville equations at hand. Moreover, the solution techniques offered in [11] and [4] differ for different boundary behaviour exhibited by X, i.e. whether the boundaries of the state space of X are absorbing or natural, etc.. Furthermore, how the function g behaves near the boundaries also matters. For instance, Beibel and Lerche [4] have to check five conditions on the behaviour of g to determine the solution.

Section 7 presents a unified solution to the above optimal stopping problem that does not depend on the behaviour of g or X on the boundaries. We use the specific recurrent transform of Proposition 3.2, which is applicable to transient as well as recurrent diffusions, to determine whether the value function is finite. We show that the value function is finite if and only if g satisfies the single condition (7.52), which depends only on the knowledge of $u^\lambda(\cdot, y)$, the λ-potential density, for some y. This recurrent transform olso changes the optimal stopping problem to one without discounting. However, the new problem becomes two-dimensional. In order to reduce the dimension of the problem to one, we apply the transformation that is defined in Section 5, which is aimed at conditioning the recurrent transformation to have a certain behaviour at the boundary points and become transient. After this transformation all that remains to do is to solve

$$\sup_{\tau} \tilde{E}^x[\bar{g}(X_\tau)],$$

where $\bar{g}$ is a function that depends only on g and $u^\lambda(\cdot, y)$, and $\tilde{E}$ corresponds to the expectation operator with respect to the law of the diffusion after the final transformation. Solution to the above is easy and well-known since Dynkin [13]: After a change of scale, the value function of the above optimal stopping problem is the concave majorant of $\bar{g}$.

It has to be noted that Cisse et al. [9] have attacked this problem using h-transforms. However, as we explain in detail in Remark 7.1 the authors make some implicit assumptions regarding the boundary behaviour of X as well as the function g in the proof of their key arguments. These assumptions in particular exclude the diffusion processes with infinite

lifetime. As we mentioned above, our approach is general and do not impose any conditions on X other than the regularity and the Engelbert-Schmidt conditions that ensures an SDE representation for X.

Differently from our treatment in Section 6 we do not investigate the impact of martingale property of X on the valuation of perpetual American options as the methodology is the same for the martingales as well as the local martingales. We refer the reader to [1] for a thorough analysis of the influence of the martingale property in a general framework.

An outline of this paper is as follows. Section 2 gives a brief overview of the several concepts related to one-dimensional diffusions that will be used throughout the paper. Section 3 introduces the concept of recurrent transformations while Section 4 considers their limit in relation to the local martingale property of X. Section 5 defines a transform designed specifically for recurrent diffusions that is different than the typical h-transform but will still render them transient, which will be useful in Section 7. Section 6 provides a resolution to the non-uniqueness issue of the Black-Scholes pricing equation and Section 7 addresses the optimal stopping problem. Section 8 concludes.

2. Preliminaries

Let X be a regular diffusion on (l,r), where $-\infty \leq l < r \leq \infty$. We assume that if any of the boundaries are reached in finite time, the process is killed and sent to the cemetery state, Δ. This is the only instance when the process can be killed, we do not allow killing inside (l,r). Consistent with the term 'killing' Δ is assumed to be an absorbing state. Such a diffusion is uniquely characterised by its scale function, s, and speed measure, m, defined on the Borel subsets of the open interval (l,r). The set of points that can be reached in finite time starting from the interior of (l,r) and the entrance boundaries will be denoted by I. That is, I is the union of (l,r) with the regular, exit or entrance boundaries. The law induced on $C(\mathbb{R}_+, I)$, the space of I-valued continuous functions on $[0,\infty)$, by X with $X_0 = x$ will be denoted by P^x as usual, while ζ will correspond to its lifetime. In what follows we will often replace ζ with ∞ when dealing with the limit values of the processes as long as no confusion arises. The filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ will correspond to the universal completion of the natural filtration of X, and therefore is right continuous since X is strong Markov by definition (see Theorem 4 in Section 2.3 in [8]). Recall that in terms of the first hitting times, $T_y := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t = y\}$ for $y \in (l,r)$, the regularity amounts to $P^x(T_y < \infty) > 0$ whenever x and y belongs to the open interval (l,r). This assumption entails in particular that s is strictly increasing and continuous (see Proposition VII.3.2 in [27]) and $0 < m((a,z) < \infty$ for all $l < a < z < r$ (see Theorem VII.3.6 and the preceding discussion in [27]).

Recurrence or transience of X depends on the behaviour of s near the boundary points. More precisely, X is transient if and only if at least one of $s(l)$ and $s(r)$ is finite. Since s is unique only upto an affine transformation, we will assume without loss of generality that $s(l) = 0$ and $s(r) = 1$ whenever they are finite. Note that In view of our foregoing assumptions one can easily deduce that $X_{\zeta-} \in \{l, r\}$ when X is transient. We refer the reader to [7] for a summary of results and references on one-dimensional diffusions. The definitive treatment of such diffusions is, of course, contained in [19].

Remark 2.1. *It has to be noted that notion of recurrence that we consider here excludes some recurrent solutions of one-dimensional SDEs with time-homogeneous coefficients since we kill our diffusion as soon as it reaches a regular boundary point. A notable example is a squared Bessel process with dimension $\delta < 2$, which solves the following SDE:*

$$X_t = x + 2\int_0^t \sqrt{X_s} dB_s + \delta t.$$

The above SDE has a global strong solution, i.e. solution for all $t \geq 0$, which is recurrent (see Section XI.1 of [27]*). However, the point* 0 *is reached a.s. and is instantaneously reflecting by Proposition XI.1.5 in* [27]*. As such, it violates our assumption of a diffusion being killed at a regular boundary. According to our assumption, a squared Bessel process of dimension $0 < \delta < 2$ has to be killed as soon as it reaches* 0 *and, thus, is a* transient *diffusion.*

As our focus is on diffusions that are also solutions of SDEs, we further impose the so-called *Engelbert-Schmidt conditions*. That is, we shall assume the existence of measurable functions $\sigma : (l, r) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $b : (l, r) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sigma(x) > 0 \text{ and } \exists \varepsilon > 0 \text{ s.t. } \int_{x-\varepsilon}^{x+\varepsilon} \frac{1 + |b(y)|}{\sigma^2(y)} dy < \infty \text{ for any } x \in (l, r). \tag{2.2}$$

Under this assumption (see [15] or Theorem 5.5.15 in [21]) there exists a *unique* weak solution (upto the exit time from the interval (l, r)) to the SDE

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s + \int_0^t b(X_s) ds, \qquad t < \zeta, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\zeta = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{t-} \in \{l, r\}\}$ and $l < x < r$. Moreover, the condition (2.2) further implies one can take

$$s(x) = \int_C^x \exp\left(-2\int_c^z \frac{b(u)}{\sigma^2(u)} du\right) dz \text{ and } m(dx) = \frac{2}{s'(x)\sigma^2(x)} dx, \text{ for some } (c, C) \in (l, r)^2. \tag{2.4}$$

We collect the assumptions on X in the following:

Assumption 2.1. *X is a regular one-dimensional diffusion on (l, r) such that*

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s + \int_0^t b(X_s) ds, \qquad t < \zeta,$$

where $\sigma : (l, r) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $b : (l, r) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ satisfy (2.2), $\zeta = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{t-} \in \{l, r\}\}$.

Any regular transient diffusion on (l, r) has a finite potential density, $u : (l, r)^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, with respect to its speed measure (see p.20 of [7]). That is, for any bounded and continuous function, f, vanishing at accessible boundaries

$$Uf(x) := \int_0^\infty E^x[f(X_t)] dt = \int_l^r f(y) u(x, y) m(dy).$$

The above implies that the potential density can be written in terms of the transition density[1], $(p(t,\cdot,\cdot))_{t\geq 0}$, of X with respect to its speed measure:

$$u(x,y)=\int_0^\infty p(t,x,y)dt.$$

The above in particular implies that $u(x,y)=u(y,x)$ since $p(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is symmetric for each $t>0$ (see p. 520 of [24]).

We will denote by $(L^x_t)_{x\in(l,r)}$ the family of semimartingale local times associated to X. Recall that the occupation times formula for the semimartingale local time is given by

$$\int_0^t f(X_s)\sigma^2(X_s)ds=\int_l^r f(x)L^x_t dx.$$

In the case of one-dimensional transient diffusions the distribution of L^y_∞ is known explicitly in terms of the potential density (see p.21 of [7]). In particular,

$$P^y(L^y_\infty>t)=\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)t}{2u(y,y)}\right). \tag{2.5}$$

Therefore, for an arbitrary starting point, x, in (l,r) and any Borel subset, E, of $\mathbb{R}_+$ we have

$$P^x(L^y_\infty\in E|\mathcal{F}_t)=\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_t\in E]}P^{X_t}(T_y=\infty)+\frac{s'(y)P^{X_t}(T_y<\infty)}{2u(y,y)}\int_E \mathbf{1}_{[a>L^y_t]}\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)(a-L^y_t)}{2u(y,y)}\right)da, \tag{2.6}$$

in view of the strong Markov property of X.

It will also prove useful in the sequel to consider the *inverse local time*:

$$\tau^y_a=\inf\{t\geq 0: L^y_t>a\}.$$

$(\tau^y_a)_{a\geq 0}$ is right continuous and, moreover,

$$\tau^y_{a-}=\inf\{t\geq 0: L^y_t\geq a\}.$$

Clearly, the interval $[\tau^y_{a-},\tau^y_a]$ corresponds to an interval of constancy for L^y or, equivalently, an excursion of X from the point y.

Note that if $s(l)=0=1-s(r)$, then $P^x(X_\infty=r)=s(r)=1-P^x(X_\infty=l)$ and

$$P^x(T_y<\infty)=\begin{cases}\frac{s(x)}{s(y)}, & y\geq x;\\ \frac{1-s(x)}{1-s(y)}, & y<x.\end{cases}\qquad\qquad u(x,y)=s(x)(1-s(y)),\ x\leq y. \tag{2.7}$$

On the other hand, if $s(l)=0$ and $s(r)=\infty$, then $X_t\to l$, P^x-a.s. for any $x\in(l,r)$, which in turn implies

$$P^x(T_y<\infty))=\begin{cases}\frac{s(x)}{s(y)}, & y\geq x;\\ 1, & y<x.\end{cases}\qquad\qquad u(x,y)=s(x),\ x\leq y. \tag{2.8}$$

Similarly, if $s(l)=-\infty$ and $s(r)=1$, then $X_t\to r$, P^x-a.s. for any $x\in(l,r)$, and

$$P^x(T_y<\infty)=\begin{cases}1, & y\geq x;\\ \frac{1-s(x)}{1-s(y)}, & y<x.\end{cases}\qquad\qquad u(x,y)=1-s(y),\ x\leq y. \tag{2.9}$$

[1]For the existence of this transition density and its boundary behaviour see Mc Kean [24].

While the potential density is finite only for transient diffusions, one can define a so-called *α-potential density* that exists and is finite for all diffusions for all $\alpha > 0$. For any bounded and continuous function f vanishing at accessible boundaries, one defines

$$U^\alpha f(x) := \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} E^x[f(X_t)dt.$$

Thus, if we let

$$u^\alpha(x,y) := \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} p(t,x,y)dt,$$

we obtain

$$U^\alpha f(x) = \int_l^r f(y)u^\alpha(x,y)m(dy).$$

$u^\alpha(\cdot,\cdot)$ is called the α-potential density and is symmetric in $(l,r)^2$ for all $\alpha > 0$. An alternative and very useful expression for u^α is given in terms of the fundamental solutions of the equation $Af = \alpha f$. That is,

$$u^\alpha(x,y) = \frac{\psi_\alpha(x)\phi_\alpha(y)}{w_\alpha}, \qquad x \le y, \tag{2.10}$$

where ψ_α and ϕ_α are, respectively, the increasing and decreasing solutions of $Af = \alpha f$, and w_α is the Wronskian given by

$$w_\alpha = \frac{\psi'_\alpha(x)\phi_\alpha(x) - \psi_\alpha(x)\phi'_\alpha(x)}{s'(x)},$$

which is independent of x. Consequently, using the relationship between the fundamental solutions of $Af = \alpha f$ and the Laplace transforms of hitting times (see p.18 of [7]), we have

$$E^x\left[\exp\left(-\alpha T_y\right)\right] = \frac{u^\alpha(x,y)}{u^\alpha(y,y)}. \tag{2.11}$$

We refer the reader to Chap. II of Borodin and Salminen [7] for a summary of results concerning one-dimensional diffusions including the ones sketched above.

3. Recurrent transformations of diffusions

This section introduces a new kind of path transformation for regular diffusions that produces a recurrent diffusion whose law is locally absolutely continuous with respect to that of the original diffusion. To wit, suppose h is a non-negative C^2-function and M an adapted continuous process of finite variation so that $h(X)M$ is a non-negative local martingale. Formally, by stopping at its localising sequence and using Girsanov's theorem we arrive at a weak solution, up to a stopping time, of the following equation for any given $x \in (l,r)$ taking values in (l,r):

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)dB_s + \int_0^t \left\{ b(X_s) + \sigma^2(X_s)\frac{h'(X_s)}{h(X_s)} \right\} ds. \tag{3.12}$$

We can associate to this SDE the scale function

$$s_r(x) := \int_c^x \frac{s'(y)}{h^2(y)}dy, \qquad x \in (l,r), \tag{3.13}$$

provided that the integral is finite for all $x \in (l,r)$, which in particular requires $h > 0$ on (l,r). This will allow us to deduce the existence of a solution to (3.12) until the first exit time from (l,r). If, in addition, $-s_r(l+) = s_r(r-) = \infty$, the solution will be recurrent and never exit (l,r) (see Proposition 5.5.22 in [21]).

Using h and M to get a recurrent process imposes some boundary conditions on h. Indeed, if $s(l) = 0$ (resp. $s(r) = 1$), in order to have $s_r(l+) = -\infty$ (resp. $s_r(r-) = \infty$), we must have $\lim_{x\to l} h(x) = 0$ (resp. $\lim_{x\to r} h(x) = 0$).

Moreover, since $h(X_t)M_t$ is a local martingale, $dM_t = -M_t \frac{Ah(X_t)}{h(X_t)}dt$. Thus, M is a multiplicative functional[2] given by

$$M_t = \exp\left(-\int_0^t \frac{Ah(X_s)}{h(X_s)}ds\right).$$

In the light of the above discussion we now introduce the concept of a *recurrent transformation of a diffusion*.

Definition 3.1. *Let X be a regular diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1 and $h : (l,r) \mapsto (0,\infty)$ be a continuous function such that the limits $h(l+) := \lim_{x\to l} h(x)$ and $h(r-) := \lim_{x\to r} h(x)$ exists. Then, (h, M) is said to be a recurrent transform (of X) if the following are satisfied:*

1. *M is an adapted process of finite variation.*
2. *$h(X)M$ is a nonnegative local martingale.*
3. *The function s_r from (3.13) is finite for all $x \in (l,r)$ with $-s_r(l+) = s_r(r-) = \infty$.*
4. *There exists a unique weak solution to (3.12) for $t \geq 0$ for any $x \in (l,r)$.*

In the above definition, the defining condition for a recurrent transformation is the function s_r and its explosive nature near the boundaries. The function h and the multiplicative functional M come into play when one wants to construct a weak solution of the SDE (3.12) and show that the law of its solution is locally absolutely continuous with respect to that of the original process X, which satisfies (2.3).

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a regular diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1. Consider an absolutely continuous function $h : (l,r) \mapsto (0,\infty)$ such that its left derivative, h', is of finite variation. Suppose further that the mapping s_r given by (3.13) is finite for all $x \in (l,r)$ and that $-s_r(l+) = s_r(r-) = \infty$. Then, the following statements are valid.*

1. *h' admists the decomposition $dh'(x) = h''(x)dx + n(dx)$, where n is a locally finite signed measure on (l,r) that is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure.*
2. *The integral*

$$\mathbf{1}_{[t<\zeta]}\left(\int_0^t |Ah(X_s)|\,ds + \int_l^r \frac{L_t^x}{2}|n(dx)|\right) < \infty,\ P^y\text{-a.s.}, \tag{3.14}$$

for every $y \in (l,r)$, where $Ah = \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2}h''(x) + b(x)h'(x)$ with an abuse of notation.

[2]See Section 1 of Chapter III and the rest in [6] for a definition and properties. We will not need any further properties of multiplicative functionals in this paper.

(3) (h, M) *is a recurrent transform, where, on* $[t < \zeta]$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &:= \exp\left(-\int_0^t \frac{Ah(X_s)}{h(X_s)}ds - \int_0^t \frac{1}{h(X_s)}d\Lambda_s(h)\right) \text{ and} \\ \Lambda_t(h) &:= \int_l^r \frac{L_t^x}{2}n(dx). \end{aligned}$$

(4) *Let* $R^{h,x}$ *be the law of the solution of (3.12) and* $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$ *for some* $(\mathcal{F}_t)$*-stopping time,* T*, such that* $h(X^T)M^T$ *is a uniformly integrable* P^y*-martingale. Then,*

$$R^{h,x}(F) = \frac{1}{h(x)}E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_F h(X_T)M_T\right]. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. (1) The decomposition follows from Theorem 0.4.4 in [27].

(2) Observe that, in view of occupation times formula, the integral in (3.14) equals on $[t < \zeta]$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_l^r \left|\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2}h''(x) + b(x)h'(x)\right| \frac{L_t^x}{\sigma^2(x)}dx + \int_l^r \frac{L_t^x}{2}|n(dx)| \\ = &\int_l^r \left|\frac{1}{2}h''(x) + \frac{b(x)}{\sigma^2(x)}h'(x)\right| L_t^x dx + \int_l^r \frac{L_t^x}{2}|n(dx)| \end{aligned}$$

Due to the continuity of X, on $[t < \zeta]$ and on almost every path L_t^x would be equal to 0 for all x outside a compact interval in (l, r), which is determined by the maximum and the minimum of X on $[0, t]$. Thus, due to the continuity of $x \mapsto L_t^x$, it suffices to check

$$\int_K \left|\frac{1}{2}h''(x) + \frac{b(x)}{\sigma^2(x)}h'(x)\right| dx + \int_K |n(dx)| < \infty \tag{3.16}$$

for an arbitrary compact K contained in (l, r). First note that

$$\int_K |h''(x)|\, dx + \int_K |n(dx)| < \infty$$

since h' is of finite variation.

Moreover,

$$\int_K \left|\frac{b(x)}{\sigma^2(x)}h'(x)\right| dx = C + \int_K \left(\int_c^y \left|\frac{2b(x)}{\sigma^2(x)}\right| dx\right) |dh'(y)|,$$

for some $C < \infty$ and $c \in K$ due to the finiteness of h' and $\int_c^y \left|\frac{2b(x)}{\sigma^2(x)}\right| dx$ at the boundary of K. However, the integral in the above representation is finite since dh' is of finite variation and $\int_c^y \left|\frac{2b(x)}{\sigma^2(x)}\right| dx$ is bounded in K. This completes the proof that (3.16) holds for an arbitrary compact set K, which in turn yields the claim.

(3) It follows from the previous part that $\Lambda(h)$ is of finite variation. Since $(h(X_s)_{s\le t}$ is away from 0, path by path for $t < \zeta$, it immediately follows that M is of finite variation, too.

Since h can be considered as a difference of convex functions, it follows from Ito-Tanaka formula that on $[t < \zeta]$

$$\begin{aligned} h(X_t) &= h(x) + \int_0^t h'(X_s)dX_s + \frac{1}{2}\int_l^r L_t^x \left\{h''(x)dx + n(dx)\right\} \\ &= \int_0^t h'(X_s)dX_s + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \sigma^2(X_s)h''(X_s)ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_l^r L_t^x n(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, a simple application of integration by parts formula yields

$$h(X_t)M_t = h(x) + \int_0^t h'(X_s)M_s\sigma(X_s)dB_s, \qquad t < \zeta,$$

proving the local martingale property for $h(X)M$. In particular, $h(X)M$ is a continuous non-negative supermartingale with an integrable limit as $t \to \zeta$.

Finally, due to the hypotheses on s_r it follows from Theorem 5.5.15 in [21] that there exists a unique weak solution to (3.12). Moreover, the solution is recurrent by Part a) of Proposition 5.5.22 in [21].

(4) Since $h(X)^T M^T$ is a uniformly integrable martingale under P^y, we deduce from Girsanov's theorem and the uniqueness in law of the solutions of (3.12) that

$$R^{h,x}(F) = \frac{1}{h(x)}E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_F h(X_T)M_T\right].$$

□

The following proposition gives an important example of a recurrent transform of transient diffusions, which will be useful in the sequel.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose X is a regular transient diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1. Let $y \in (l,r)$ be fixed and consider the pair (h,M) defined by*

$$h(x) := u(x,y),\ x \in (l,r),\ \text{and } M_t = \exp\left(\frac{s'(y)L_t^y}{2u(y,y)}\right).$$

Then, the following hold:

(1) *(h,M) is a recurrent transform for X.*

(2) *There exists a unique weak solution to*

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)dB_s + \int_0^t \left\{b(X_s) + \sigma^2(X_s)\frac{u_x(X_s,y)}{u(X_s,y)}\right\}ds, \qquad t \geq 0, \tag{3.17}$$

for any $x \in (l,r)$, where u_x denotes the first partial left derivative of $u(x,y)$ with respect to x.

(3) *Moreover, if $R^{h,x}$ denotes the law of the solution and T is a stopping time such that $R^{h,x}(T < \infty) = 1$, then for any $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$ the following identity holds:*

$$P^x(\zeta > T, F) = u(x,y)E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_F \frac{1}{u(X_T,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L_T^y\right)\right], \tag{3.18}$$

where $E^{h,x}$ is the expectation operator with respect to the probability measure $R^{h,x}$.

Consequently, $H(X)M$ is a P^x-martingale for any $x \in (l,r)$.

Proof. (1) It follows from (2.7)-(2.9) that $x \mapsto u(x,y)$ is absolutely continuous and its left derivative is of finite variation. In particular,

$$n(dx) = -s'(y)\varepsilon_y,$$

where ε_y is the dirac measure at point y and η is the measure defined in Theorem 3.1. This further implies $\Lambda_t(h) = -\frac{s'(y)}{2}L^y_t$. Since Ah vanishes, Theorem 3.1 suggests we define

$$M_t = \exp\left(\int_0^t \frac{s'(y)}{2u(X_s,y)}dL^y_s\right) = \exp\left(\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L^y_t\right),$$

where the last equality is due to the fact that the support of dL^y is carried by the set $\{t : X_t = y\}$.

Next, consider the function

$$s_r(x) = \int_y^x \frac{s'(z)}{(u(z,y))^2}dz,$$

and suppose, first, that $s(l) = 1 - s(r) = 0$. Then, for $x < y$,

$$s_r(x) = \frac{1}{(1-s(y))^2}\int_y^x \frac{s'(z)}{s^2(z)}dz = \frac{1}{(1-s(y))^2}\left(\frac{1}{s(y)} - \frac{1}{s(x)}\right),$$

which in particular shows that $\lim_{x\to l} s_r(x) = -\infty$. Similarly, for $x > y$,

$$s_r(x) = \frac{1}{s^2(y))}\int_y^x \frac{s'(z)}{(1-s(z))^2}dz = \frac{1}{s^2(y)}\left(\frac{1}{1-s(x)} - \frac{1}{1-s(y)}\right),$$

and, thus, $s_r(\infty) = \infty$. The other cases are handled the same way to show $-s_r(l) = s_r(r) = \infty$. This completes the proof of that (h, M) is a recurrent transform via Theorem 3.1.

(2) This follows from the previous part and the definition of a recurrent transformation.

(3) Since $h(X^{\tau^y_{a-}})M^{\tau^y_{a-}}$ is a bounded martingale, it follows from (3.15) that

$$\frac{dR^{h,x}}{dP^x}\Big|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau^y_{a-}}} = \frac{u(y,y)}{u(x,y)}\exp\left(\frac{as'(y)}{2u(y,y)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau^y_{a-}<\zeta]}. \tag{3.19}$$

Thus, if T is an $R^{h,x}$-a.s. finite stopping time,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_F\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_T\le a]}\frac{1}{u(X_T,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L^y_T\right)\right] \\
= \; & E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_F\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_T\le a]}\frac{1}{u(X_T,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L^y_T\right)\frac{u(y,y)}{u(x,y)}\exp\left(\frac{as'(y)}{2u(y,y)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau^y_{a-}<\zeta]}\right] \\
= \; & E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_F\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_T\le a]}\frac{1}{u(X_T,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L^y_T\right)\frac{u(X_{\tau^y_{a-}},y)}{u(x,y)}\exp\left(\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L^y_{\tau^y_{a-}}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau^y_{a-}<\zeta]}\right] \\
= \; & \frac{1}{u(x,y)}E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_F\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_T\le a]}\mathbf{1}_{[T<\zeta]}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is a consequence of the above absolute continuity relationship, the second equality is due to the fact that $X_{\tau^y_{a-}} = y$ on $[\tau^y_{a-} < \zeta]$, and the last line follows from $h(X^{\tau^y_{a-}})M^{\tau^y_{a-}}$ being a bounded P^x-martingale as observed above,

Next note that $L^y_T < \infty$ $R^{h,x}$-a.s. since $R^{h,x}(T < \infty) = 1$, and $t \mapsto L^y_t$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$. Moreover, $P^x(L^y_T < \infty) = 1$ as well since $L^y_T \leq L^y_\zeta < \infty$, P^x-a.s. for X is a transient diffusion under P^x. Therefore, letting $a \to \infty$ the claim follows from the monotone convergence theorem.

By considering the identity (3.18) at deterministic times we deduce that $h(X)M$ is in fact a martingale since $h(X_\zeta) = 0$ and $M_\zeta < \infty$, P^x-a.s.. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} E^x[h(X_t)M_t] &= E^x\left[h(X_t)M_t\mathbf{1}_{[t<\zeta]}\right] = u(x,y)E^{h,x}\left[h(X_t)M_t\frac{1}{u(X_T,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L^y_T\right)\right] \\ &= u(x,y) = h(X_0)M_0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next example of a recurrent transform that we shall consider in this paper is obtained via the α-potential density, u^α of X. In contrast with the previous transform, which only exists for transient diffusions, the next transform can be applied to all regular diffusions. Moreover, the resulting diffusion will be *positive recurrent*.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose X is a regular diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1. Let $y \in (l,r)$ and $\alpha > 0$ be fixed and consider the pair (h,M) defined by*

$$h(x) := u^\alpha(x,y),\ x \in (l,r),\ \text{and } M_t = \exp\left(-\alpha t + \frac{s'(y)L^y_t}{2u^\alpha(y,y)}\right).$$

Then, the following hold:

1. *(h,M) is a recurrent transform for X.*
2. *There exists a unique weak solution to*

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)dB_s + \int_0^t \left\{b(X_s) + \sigma^2(X_s)\frac{u^\alpha_x(X_s,y)}{u^\alpha(X_s,y)}\right\}ds, \qquad t \geq 0, \tag{3.20}$$

   for any $x \in (l,r)$, where u^α_x denotes the first partial left derivative of $u^\alpha(x,y)$ with respect to x.
3. *Moreover, the diffusion defined by the solutions of (3.20) is positive recurrent and its stationary distribution on (l,r) is given by*

$$\pi(dx) = \frac{(u^\alpha(x,y))^2}{\int_0^\infty se^{-\alpha s}p(s,y,y)ds}m(dx), \tag{3.21}$$

   where $(p(t,\cdot,\cdot))_{t>0}$ is the transition density of the originial diffusion, X, with respect to its speed measure, m.

Proof. Note in view of (2.10) that $\frac{\partial u^\alpha(\cdot,y)}{\partial x}$ has a jump at $x = y$, whose size equals

$$\frac{\phi'_\alpha(y)\psi_\alpha(y) - \psi'_\alpha(y)\phi_\alpha(y)}{w_\alpha} = -s'(y).$$

Moreover, with the same abuse of notation as in Part (2) of Theorem 3.1, $Au^\alpha(\cdot,y) = \alpha u^\alpha(x,y)$. Furthermore, since $u^\alpha(x,y) < u(x,y)$ for all $\alpha > 0$,

$$\left|\int_c^x \frac{s'(z)}{(u^\alpha(z,y))^2}dz\right| \geq \left|\int_c^x \frac{s'(z)}{(u(z,y))^2}dz\right|, \ \forall x \in (l,r).$$

Thus, repeating the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition 3.1 we show that (h,M) is a recurrent transform and there exists a unique weak solution of (3.20) when X is transient.

To arrive at the same conclusion when X is recurrent, we only need to check that $-s_r(l+) = s_r(r-) = \infty$. Indeed, assuming X is on natural scale without loss of generality, we have

$$s_r(x) = \int_c^x \frac{1}{(u^\alpha(z,y))^2}dz = \frac{1}{(u^\alpha(y,y))^2}\int_c^x \frac{1}{(E^z\left[e^{-\alpha T_y}\right])^2}dz$$

in view of (2.11). Note that since X is recurrent and on natural scale, we necessarily have $r = -l = \infty$. Therefore,

$$\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\left(E^z\left[e^{-\alpha T_y}\right]\right)^2}dz = \infty$$

as $\frac{1}{\left(E^z\left[e^{-\alpha T_y}\right]\right)^2} > 1$ for all z. Similarly,

$$\int_c^{-\infty} \frac{1}{\left(E^z\left[e^{-\alpha T_y}\right]\right)^2}dz = -\infty.$$

Note that the speed measure of the recurrent transform defined by (3.20) is given by $(u^\alpha(x,y))^2 m(dx)$. Thus, it remains to show that

$$\int_l^r (u^\alpha(x,y))^2 m(dx) = \int_0^\infty s e^{-\alpha s} p(s,y,y)ds < \infty$$

since the stationary distribution of a one-dimensional diffusion is given by its speed measure when it is finite (see p.37 of [7]). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_l^r (u^\alpha(x,y))^2 m(dx) &= \int_l^r \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha(t+s)} p(t,x,y)p(s,x,y)dsdtm(dx) \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha(t+s)} \int_l^r p(t,y,x)p(s,x,y)m(dx)dsdt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha(t+s)} p(t+s,y,y)dsdt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_t^\infty e^{-\alpha u} p(u,y,y)dudt \\
&= \int_0^\infty u e^{-\alpha u} p(u,y,y)du \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^\infty e^{-(\alpha-\varepsilon)u} p(u,y,y)du \\
&= \frac{u^{\alpha-\varepsilon}(y,y)}{\varepsilon} < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \alpha)$. In above, the first equality follows from (2.10), the second is due the symmetry of the transition density and the Fubini's theorem, while the third is a consequence of Chapman-Kolmogorov identity. □

Example 3.1. *Suppose X is a standard Brownian motion. It is well-known that*

$$u^{\alpha}(x,y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \exp\left(-\sqrt{2\alpha}|x-y|\right).$$

Thus, if we use the transform in Proposition 3.2 with $y = 0$, the recurrent transform is the solution to the following SDE:

$$dX_t = dB_t - \sqrt{2\alpha} sgn(X_t)dt,$$

where $sgn(x) = -\mathbf{1}_{[x<0]} + \mathbf{1}_{[x\geq 0]}$. This is a Brownian motion with alternating state-dependent drift, which plays a key role in the so-called bang-bang *control problem (see Section 6.6.5 in* [21] *and the references therein).*

We shall consider in subsequent sections the applications of the above recurrent transforms to optimal stopping as well as some pricing issues arising in Black-Scholes models when the stock price follows a strict local martingale. However, one can find an immediate application of the recurrent transform to the computation of the distribution of the first exit time for a one-dimensional diffusion from an interval. Indeed, such a first exit time can always be viewed as the life time of a transient diffusion by killing the original one as soon as it exits the given interval. Thus, the problem reduces to finding $P^x(\zeta > t)$ for all $t > 0$, where P^x is the law of the transient diffusion starting at x and ζ is its lifetime, i.e. the first time it exits the given interval. The following is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.1.

Corollary 3.1. *Let X be a regular transient diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1. Then*

$$P^x(\zeta > t) = u(x,y)E^{h,x}\left[\frac{1}{u(X_t,y)} \exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L_t^y\right)\right],$$

where $E^{h,x}$ is the expectation operator with respect to the law of the recurrent transform given by (3.17).

Although the above formula does not in general give $P^x(\zeta > t)$ in closed-form, it is nevertheless practical. Indeed, by running a Monte-Carlo simulation of the solution of (3.17), one can get a close estimate of

$$E^{h,x}\left[\frac{1}{u(X_t,y)} \exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L_t^y\right)\right]$$

by approximating the local time using the occupation times formula.

Karatzas and Ruf [20] have shown that the function $v(t,x) := P^x(\zeta > t)$ is the smallest nonnegative classical supersolution of

$$v_t = Av, \qquad v(0,\cdot) = 1 \tag{3.22}$$

under the assumption that σ and b are locally uniformly Hölder continuous on (l,r). Thus, combining their Proposition 5.4 and Corollary 3.1 we deduce the following.

Corollary 3.2. *Let X be a regular transient diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1. Assume further that σ and b that appears in (2.3) are locally uniformly Hölder continuous on (l, r). Define*

$$v(t,x) := u(x,y)E^{h,x}\left[\frac{1}{u(X_t,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{s'(y)}{2u(y,y)}L_t^y\right)\right],$$

where $E^{h,x}$ is the expectation operator with respect to the law of the recurrent transform given by (3.17). Then, v is the smallest nonnegative classical supersolution of (3.22).

4. Limits of recurrent transforms and strict local martingales

Motivation of this section comes from the financial models that we shall treat in more detail in Section 6. Consistent with the setting therein X will assumed to be a non-negative diffusion in natural scale in this section. As our focus is on strict local martingales this necessitates the choice of $r = \infty$. Consequently, $u(x, y) = x \wedge y$ and the recurrent transform in (3.17) reads

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)dB_s + \int_0^t \frac{\sigma^2(X_s)}{X_s}\mathbf{1}_{[X_s<y]}ds, \quad x > 0. \tag{4.23}$$

We have established in Proposition 3.1 that the above SDE has a non-explosive weak solution that is unique in law. Moreover, the solution never hits 0. If $(X^y)_{y>0}$ denotes the solutions of (4.23) indexed by y, we notice immediately that the drift term associated to X^y is increasing in y. Thus, if the solutions are strong, we may hope that the solutions are increasing in y under a mild hypothesis on σ. Then, if we let $Y_t := \lim_{y\to\infty} X_t^y$, the resulting limit is expected to satisfy

$$Y_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(Y_s)dB_s + \int_0^t \frac{\sigma^2(Y_s)}{Y_s}ds, \quad x > 0. \tag{4.24}$$

Since Y is obtained as an increasing limit of X^y, it will never hit 0. However, its behaviour near the infinite boundary, and in particular whether it may explode in finite time, requires a further look. We shall in fact see that Y is the SDE satisfied by the h-transform of X, where $h(x) = x$, and its explosive behaviour depends exclusively on the strict local martingale property of X.

The next assumption will be sufficient to ensure that the solutions of (4.23) are strong and increase in y. Note that one could get the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions under weaker hypothesis. However, the following stronger condition is imposed since we are also interested in a comparison result for the strong solutions.

Assumption 4.1. *There exists a Borel function $\rho : (0,\infty) \mapsto (0,\infty)$ with*

$$\int_{0+}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\rho(a)}da = \infty$$

such that

$$(\sigma(x) - \sigma(y))^2 \le \rho(|x-y|), \qquad x \neq y.$$

As we will be working with strong solutions in this section let us fix a Brownian motion, β, on a fixed probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$, where $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is as in Section 2, so that

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) d\beta_s, \quad x > 0. \tag{4.25}$$

It follows from Theorem IX.3.5 in [27] and Corollary 5.3.23 in [21] that X is the unique strong solution of (4.25) under Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1.

What we would like to achieve next is to pass to a locally absolutely continuous measure, which will support all the solutions of (4.23). The next result does not need Assumption 4.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 is in force and X satisfies (4.25) on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$ supporting the Brownian motion, β. There exists a $\mathbb{Q}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ and a sequence of stopping times $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 1}$ such that i) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{Q}(\tau_n \leq t) = 0$, ii) $\mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}} \ll \mathbb{P}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}}$ and iii)*

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s + \int_0^t \frac{\sigma^2(X_s)}{X_s} \mathbf{1}_{[X_s<1]} ds,$$

where B is a $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{Q})$-Brownian motion.

Proof. Consider the (h, M) transform in Proposition 3.1, where $y = 1$, and set $\tau_n := \tau^1_{n-}$. Then, $h(X_{t\wedge\tau_n})M_{t\wedge\tau_n}$ is a bounded martingale that defines a $\mathbb{Q}_n$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}$. Note that $\mathbb{Q}_n(\tau_n \leq t) = R^{h,x}(L^y_t \geq n)$ using the notation of Proposition 3.1. Thus, $\lim_{n\to\infty} Q_n(\tau_n \leq t) = \lim_{n\to\infty} R^{h,x}(L^y_t \geq n) = R^{h,x}(L^y_t = \infty) = 0$, and i) and ii) follow from Theorem 1.3.5 in [29].

Moreover, since $\mathbb{Q}$ agrees with $\mathbb{Q}_n$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}$, we have

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s + \int_0^t \frac{\sigma^2(X_s)}{X_s} \mathbf{1}_{[X_s<1]} ds, \quad t < \tau_n,$$

where

$$B_t = \beta_t - \int_0^t \frac{\sigma(X_s)}{X_s} \mathbf{1}_{[X_s<1]} ds, \quad t < \tau_n.$$

As such, B is a Brownian motion stopped at τ_n. Invoking the fact that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{Q}(\tau_n \leq t) = 0$ yields iii). □

The above proposition constructs a locally absolutely continuous probability measure, $\mathbb{Q}$, and a $\mathbb{Q}$-Brownian motion, B. Thus, once we impose Assumption 4.1, (4.23) will possess the pathwise uniqueness property by virtue of Proposition IX.3.1 and Lemma IX.3.1 in [27]. Combining this with Corollary 5.3.23 in [21] we arrive at the following.

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 hold. Let B and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{Q})$ be as in Proposition 4.1. Then, for each $y > 0$, there exists a unique strong solution to (4.23).*

As mentioned earlier Assumption 4.1 will also imply that the solutions of (4.23) are increasing in y.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 hold. Let B and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{Q})$ be as in Proposition 4.1 and denote by X^y the unique strong solution of (4.23). Then, $\mathbb{Q}(X^{y_0}_t \leq X^{y_1}_t, \forall t \geq 0) = 1$ whenever $y_0 \leq y_1$.*

Proof. Let $b_i(x) = \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{x}\mathbf{1}_{[x<y_i]}$ for $i = 0, 1$, and define $b^\varepsilon(x) = b_1(x) + \varepsilon$. Observe that there exists a Lipschitz function, g, such that $b_0(x) \le g(x) \le b^\varepsilon(x)$ for $x > 0$ due to the continuity of σ. Thus, it follows from Theorem 1.1 in Chap. VI of [18] that $X_t^{y_0} \le Z_t^\varepsilon$ for all $t \ge 0$, where

$$Z_t^\varepsilon = x + \int_0^t \sigma(Z_s^\varepsilon)dB_s + \int_0^t b^\varepsilon(Z_s^\varepsilon)ds.$$

Note that since σ satisfies (2.2) and Assumption 4.1 the above SDE has a unique strong solution. Next, we claim that $Z_t^\varepsilon \to X_t^{y_1}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Indeed, we can again find a Lipschitz continuous function between b^{ε_0} and b^{ε_1} whenever $\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_1$. Therefore, the same theorem in [18] yields that Z_t^ε is increasing in ε for each t. Set $Z_t = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} Z_t^\varepsilon$. It follows from the continuity of σ and the dominated convergence theorem for stochastic integrals that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_0^t \sigma(Z_s^\varepsilon)dB_s = \int_0^t \sigma(Z_s)dB_s.$$

Also observe that $Z_t < y_1$ if and only if $Z_t^\varepsilon < y_1$ for all but finitely many ε (number possibly depending on ω) since Z^ε is decreasing to Z as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Thus, $b^\varepsilon(Z_t^\varepsilon) \to b_1(Z_t)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for each $t > 0$. Since $(b^{\varepsilon_n})_{n\ge1}$ is uniformly bounded given any $(\varepsilon_n)_{n\ge1}$ converging to 0, we deduce from Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_0^t b^\varepsilon(Z_s^\varepsilon)ds = \int_0^t b_1(Z_s)ds.$$

Thus, we have shown that Z solves (4.23) with $y = y_1$. Since X^{y_1} is the unique solution of this equation, we therefore establish that $X_t^{y_1} = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} Z_t^\varepsilon$. Hence, for every $t \ge 0$ we have $X_t^{y_0} \le X_t^{y_1}$ and, due to the continuity of X^{y_i}s, we may choose a null set independent of t to conclude $\mathbb{Q}(X_t^{y_0} \le X_t^{y_1},\ \forall t \ge 0) = 1$. □

Thanks to the above result X^y is increasing in y and we can define $Y_t = \lim_{y\to\infty} X_t^y$. Moreover, the arguments used in the proof of the above proposition yields the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 hold and let X^y be the unique strong solution of (4.23), where B and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{Q})$ are as in Proposition 4.1. Then, Y is the unique strong solution of (4.24), where $Y_t = \lim_{y\to\infty} X_t^y$.*

It can be checked easily that the scale function of the diffusion in (4.24) is $1 - \frac{1}{x}$. Thus, the solution never hits 0 and diverges to ∞ as $t \to \infty$. Whether the explosion happens in finite time depends on the martingale property of X. Note that if one is content with weak solutions, (4.24) has a unique weak solution when σ satisfies (2.2).

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that σ satisfies (2.2) and consider a weak solution, Y, of (4.24). Let Q^x be the law of the solution of (4.24) and define $\zeta := \inf\{t : Y_t = \infty\}$. Then $Q^x(Y_t > 0,\ \forall t > 0) = 1$. Moreover, $Q^x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ if and only if X is a martingale, where X is given by (4.25).*

Proof. Since the scale function of Y only vanishes at ∞, it follows from Theorem 5.5.29 and Problem 5.5.27 in [21] that $Q^x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ if and only if

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \int_1^x \frac{x-z}{x} \frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)} dz = \infty.$$

However,

$$\int_1^x \frac{x-z}{x} \frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)} dz = \frac{1}{x} \int_c^x \int_c^y \frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)} dz dy.$$

Thus, the above limit is valid if and only if

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)} dz = \infty,$$

which is well-known to be equivalent to the martingale property of X (see, e.g., Theorem 1 in [23]). □

Remark 4.1. *Using the methods employed in the proof of Theorem 3.1 one can show that the law of (4.24) is equal to that of the h-transform of X, where $h(x) = x$. The relationship between the martingale property of X and the finiteness of the explosion time of its h-transform, i.e. Proposition 4.4, has already been observed in the literature (see, e.g.,* [17] *or, more recently,* [22]*).*

As observed earlier $1 - 1/x$ is a scale function of Y. Consequently, $1/Y$ is a nonnegative local martingale. It turns out that the martingale property of $1/Y$ is determined by whether X hits 0 or not.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that σ satisfies (2.2) and let Y be a weak solution of (4.24), whose law is denoted by Q^x. Then, $\frac{1}{Y}$ is a Q^x martingale if and only if $\mathbb{P}(X_t > 0,\ \forall t > 0) = 1$, where X is given by (4.25).*

Proof. Denote $\frac{1}{Y}$ by ξ. Then,

$$d\xi_t = \sigma(\frac{1}{\xi_t})\xi_t^2 dB_t$$

for some Brownian motion B. It follows from Theorem 1 in [23] that ξ is a martingale if and only if

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{\sigma^2(\frac{1}{z})z^3} dz = \infty.$$

However, after a change of variable the above condition is equivalent to

$$\int_0^1 \frac{x}{\sigma^2(x)} dx = \infty,$$

which is equivalent to the strict positivity of X by Theorem 5.5.29 in [21]. □

Another manifestation of the martingale property of X appears when one considers the weak limit of the processes $(X^y)_{y>0}$ as $y \to \infty$. Although we have established the a.s. convergence of X^y to Y, Y is the weak limit of X^y if and only if X is a martingale.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that σ satisfies (2.2) and let X^y denote a weak solution of (4.23). Then, X^y converges weakly to a weak solution of (4.24) if and only if X is a martingale, where X is given by (4.25).*

Proof. Recall from Proposition 3.1 that the change of measure to obtain X^y is given by $N_t^y := (X_t \wedge y) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2y} L_t^y\right)$, which is a martingale in view of Proposition 3.1. Moreover, since $\lim_{y\to\infty} L_t^y = 0$, $\lim_{y\to\infty} N_t^y = X_t$, which is a local martingale that one can use to obtain a weak solution of (4.24). The claim now follows directly from Theorem 1.1 in [5]. □

5. Yet another transform for recurrent diffusions

We have noted in Section 3 a remarkable transform that turned any regular diffusion into a positively recurrent one. This section will present a particular type of transformation for recurrent diffusions that will render them transient. This transformation will be especially useful when we consider the optimal stopping problems in Section 7.

When X is a transient diffusion with $s(l) = 0$, it converges to l with positive probability. If one wants to condition this process to converge to r with probability 1, it suffices to use the h-transform with $h = s$ (see, e.g. Section 6 in [16]). If X is recurrent, on the other hand, the range of s is the whole real line so one needs to consider taking absolute values to obtain a positive local martingale using s. The next proposition introduces a particular conditioning for recurrent diffusions that conditions X_∞ to exist and take values in the set $\{l, r\}$. Similar to the martingale characterisation of a positive diffusion in natural scale in terms of the explosion time of its h-transform that we have seen in Proposition 4.4, the resulting diffusion will turn out to have a finite explosion time if and only if $s(X)$ is a strict local martingale.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose X is a recurrent diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1. Let $c > 0$ be fixed and y^* be the unique point in (l, r) such that $s(y^*) = 0$. Then, the following statements are valid:*

(1) *N is a local martingale, where*

$$N_t := (1 + c|s(X_t)|) \exp\left(-cs'(y^*) L_t^{y^*}\right).$$

(2) *For any $x \in (l, r)$ there exists a unique weak solution to*

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s + \int_0^t \left\{ b(X_s) - c\frac{s'(X_s)}{1 - cs(X_s)} \mathbf{1}_{[X_s < y^*]} + c\frac{s'(X_s)}{1 + cs(X_s)} \mathbf{1}_{[X_s \geq y^*]} \right\}, \quad t < \zeta, \tag{5.26}$$

where $\zeta := \inf\{t : X_{t-} \in \{l, r\}\}$.

(3) *The regular diffusion defined by (5.26) has scale function*

$$\tilde{s}(x) := \frac{1 + c(s(x) + |s(x)|)}{2(1 + c|s(x)|)}, \tag{5.27}$$

and speed measure

$$\tilde{m}(dx) = \frac{4(1 + c|s(x)|)^2}{c\sigma^2(x)s'(x)} dx = \frac{2(1 + c|s(x)|)^2}{c} m(dx).$$

$\tilde{P}^x(X_\zeta = r) = \tilde{s}(x) = 1 - \tilde{P}^x(X_\zeta = l)$, *where* $\tilde{P}^x$ *denotes the law of (5.26). Moreover,* $\tilde{P}^x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ *if and only if* $s(X)$ *is a* P^x*-martingale.*

(4) *For any* $F \in \mathcal{F}_t$ *the following absolute continuity relationship holds.*

$$\tilde{P}^x(F, \zeta > t) = \frac{E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_F N_t\right]}{1 + c|s(x)|}. \tag{5.28}$$

Consequently, N *is a martingale if and only if* $s(X)$ *is.*

Proof. Note that $1 + c|s(x)|$ is absolutely continuous with a jump in its left derivative at $x = y^*$ with size $2cs'(y^*)$. Thus, N is a local martingale due Ito-Tanaka formula as in Proposition 3.1. Moreover, the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 also yields the existence of a weak solution to (5.26), which is unique in law.

By direct manipulation one can also verify that $\tilde{s}$ and $\tilde{m}$ are a scale function and a speed measure for the solutions of (5.26). That $\tilde{P}^x(X_\zeta = r) = \tilde{s}(x)$ follows directly from the statement preceding (2.7).

According to Theorem 5.5.29 in [21] $\tilde{P}^x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ if and only if

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \int_{y^*}^{x} \tilde{s}(x) - \tilde{s}(z)\tilde{m}(dz) = \lim_{x\to-\infty} \int_{x}^{y^*} \tilde{s}(z) - \tilde{s}(x)\tilde{m}(dz) = \infty.$$

However, the above hold if and only if

$$\int_{y^*}^{\infty} \frac{s(z)}{\sigma^2(z)s'(z)}dz = -\int_{-\infty}^{y^*} \frac{s(z)}{\sigma^2(z)s'(z)}dz = \infty,$$

which is equivalent to the martingale property of $s(X)$ by Theorem 1 of [23].

In order to prove the remaining assertions let $l < a < b < r$ and $T_{a,b} := \inf\{t : X_t \notin (a, b)\}$. Then, $N^{T_{a,b}}$ is a bounded positive martingale. Therefore,

$$\tilde{P}^x(t < T_{a,b}, F) = \frac{E^x[\mathbf{1}_{[t<T_{a,b}]}N_t]}{1 + c|s(x)|}.$$

Note that $T^{a,b} \to \zeta$ under P^x and $\tilde{P}^x$. However, $\zeta = \infty$, P^x-a.s. and (5.28) follows from the dominated convergence theorem.

(5.28) in particular implies

$$\tilde{P}^x(\zeta > t) = \frac{E^x\left[N_t\right]}{1 + c|s(x)|}.$$

Thus, $\tilde{P}^x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ iff

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{E^x\left[N_t\right]}{1 + c|s(x)|} = 1.$$

However, since N is a supermartingale, the above limit holds if and only if N is a martingale. Hence, we conclude by the previous part, which has established the equivalence of the martingale property of $s(X)$ and $\tilde{P}^x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$. □

Example 5.1. *Suppose that X is a Brownian motion so that $y^* = 0$. Then, taking $c = 1$ in Proposition 5.1 implies that the transformed process is a weak solution of*

$$X_t = x + B_t + \int_0^t \frac{sgn(X_s)}{1 + |X_s|} ds, \qquad t > 0,$$

where $sgn(x) = -\mathbf{1}_{[x<0]} + \mathbf{1}_{[x\geq 0]}$. Roughly speaking $1+|X|$ behaves like a 3-dimensional Bessel process away from 0. Observe that the above SDE has a non-exploding solution since Brownian motion is a martingale. Moreover, X_∞ exists and equals ∞ or $-\infty$ with probabilities $\tilde{s}(x)$ and $1 - \tilde{s}(x)$, respectively.

6. Non-uniqueness of the Black-Scholes equation

As promised earlier we will now apply the results of Sections 3 and 4 to financial models, where the stock price movements are governed by a regular one-dimensional diffusion. To simplify the exposition we shall assume that the interest rate is 0. Our interest is in the pricing equation for a derivative contract written on this stock. The Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing (see [12]) stipulates that the stock price must follow a local martingale under an equivalent probability measure, i.e. risk-neutral measure, and the price of the derivative contract equals the expectation of its terminal payoff under this measure if it is replicable.

Throughout this section we will assume that the stock price under the unique risk-neutral measure is given by

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s, \quad X_0 > 0, \tag{6.29}$$

on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, where X_0 is deterministic and σ satisfies (2.2) on $(0, \infty)$ as well as Assumption 4.1. In particular X is the unique strong solution of the above equation. We also impose the condition that X is a strict local martingale, i.e.

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)} dz < \infty. \tag{6.30}$$

Remark 6.1. *Note that we do not assume X is always strictly positive, i.e. X can hit 0 in finite time with positive probability. If this is the case we assume that X stays at 0 consistent with the local martingale property.*

The strict local martingale assumption places a *bubble* on the stock price in the sense that it is valued higher in the market than its expected future cash flows. Appearance of bubbles causes many standard results in derivative pricing theory become invalid (see [10] and [25]). In particular, the Cauchy problem associated to the prices of European options do not admit a unique solution. More precisely, Ekström and Tysk have shown the following:

Theorem 6.1 (Theorem 3.2 in [14])**.** *Suppose that σ satisfies (2.2) on $(0, \infty)$, (6.30) and Assumption 4.1. Consider a continuous function $g : [0, \infty) \mapsto [0, \infty)$ of at most linear growth and define $v(t, x) := E^x[g(X_t)]$, where X is the unique solution of (6.29). If $P^x(\inf\{t : X_t = 0\} < \infty) > 0$ for some $x > 0$, assume further that $g(0) = 0$. Then, v is a classical solution of the Cauchy problem*

$$v_t = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 v_{xx}, \qquad v(0, \cdot) = g. \tag{6.31}$$

Non-uniqueness of the Cauchy problem is implicit in the above theorem. Indeed, if we let $g(x) = x$ and $w(x) = x$, both w and v are solutions of (6.31). Yet, $E^x[X_t] \neq x$ since X is a strict local martingale.

The equation (6.31) is called the *Black-Scholes pricing equation* in the literature. If g is the time-T payoff of a European derivative written on the stock, $v(T-t, X_t)$ gives the price of this derivative, where v is the solution of (6.31).

On the other hand the arbitrage pricing theory states that the price of the derivative at time-t equals $E^{X_t}[g(X_{T-t})]$ for a sufficiently well-behaved payoff since the risk-neutral measure is unique. Although Theorem 6.1 shows that the function defined by this alternative pricing formula still satisfies the Black-Scholes equation non-uniqueness of the Cauchy problem is problematic especially when one has to rely on numerical methods to find the solution.

The goal of this section is to identify $E^x[g(X_t)]$ as the unique solution of *some* Cauchy problem. Theorem 6.1 shows that there is no hope if we work with the differential operator associated to the generator of X. However, the solutions of (4.24) which can be interpreted as the limit of recurrent transforms of X or, in view of Remark 4.1, as an h-transform of X come to our rescue.

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose that σ satisfies (2.2) on $(0,\infty)$, (6.30) and Assumption 4.1. Consider a continuous function $g : [0,\infty) \mapsto [0,\infty)$ of at most linear growth at infinity and $g(0) = 0$ whenever $P^x(\inf\{t : X_t = 0\} < \infty) > 0$ for some $x > 0$. Let $v(t,x) := E^x[g(X_t)]$, where X is the unique solution of (6.29). Then, the following statements are valid:*

(1) *$v(t,x) = xw(t,x)$, where w is the unique classical nonnegative solution of*

$$w_t(t,x) = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)w_{xx}(t,x) + \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{x}w_x(t,x); \tag{6.32}$$

$$w(0,x) = \frac{g(x)}{x} \tag{6.33}$$

among the class of functions satisfying the following conditions:

(a) *w is of $O(x^{-1})$ as $x \to 0$:*

$$\lim_{x\to 0}\sup_{s\leq t} xw(s,x) < \infty, \qquad \forall t > 0. \tag{6.34}$$

Moreover, if X reaches 0 in finite time

$$\lim_{x\to 0}\sup_{s\leq t} xw(s,x) = 0, \qquad \forall t > 0. \tag{6.35}$$

(b) *w approaches to 0 near infinity:*

$$\forall t > 0,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} w(t_n, x_n) = 0 \text{ if } x_n \uparrow \infty \text{ and } t_n \to t. \tag{6.36}$$

(2) *If Y is a weak solution of (4.24) and Q^x is its law,*

$$w(t,x) = Q^x\left[\frac{g(Y_t)}{Y_t}\mathbf{1}_{[\zeta>t]}\right], \tag{6.37}$$

where ζ corresponds to the lifetime of Y.

Proof. As mentioned in Remark 4.1, the process Y can be considered as an h-transform of X with $h(x) = x$. Indeed, if $\tau_n := \inf\{t : X_t \notin (\frac{1}{n}, n)\}$, X^{τ_n} is a bounded martingale and a straightforward application of Girsanov's theorem yields that X is a weak solution of (4.24) upto τ_n. Therefore,

$$E^x\left[g(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{[t<\tau_n]}\right] = E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_{[t<\tau_n]}\frac{g(X_t)}{X_t}X_t\right] = xQ^x\left[\mathbf{1}_{[t<\tau_n]}\frac{g(X_t)}{X_t}\right],$$

where Q^x is the unique law of solutions of (4.24).

Observe that τ_n converges to the lifetime, ζ, of X under P^x and Q^x. Moreover, since X is a positive supermartingale, $P^x(\zeta = \inf\{t : X_t = 0\}) = 1$ while $Q^x(\zeta = \inf\{t : X_{t-} = \infty\} = 1$ by Proposition 4.4 since the scale function of (4.24) is $1 - 1/x$. Thus, the monotone convergence theorem together with the assumption that $g(0) = 0$ when 0 is an accessible boundary under P^x yields

$$xQ^x\left[\mathbf{1}_{[t<\zeta]}\frac{g(X_t)}{X_t}\right] = E^x\left[g(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{[t<\zeta]}\right] = E^x\left[g(X_t)\right] = v(t,x). \tag{6.38}$$

Thus, $v(t,x) = xw(t,x)$, where w is as defined in (6.37), since the law of Y is the same as that of X under Q^x.

Recall from Theorem 6.1 that v satisfies (6.31). This automatically implies w satisfy (6.32) and (6.33). To prove the other properties for w fix an $m > 0$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} w(t,x) &= Q^x\left[\mathbf{1}_{[t<\zeta]}\mathbf{1}_{[Y_t>m]}\frac{g(Y_t)}{Y_t}\right] + Q^x\left[\mathbf{1}_{[t<\zeta]}\mathbf{1}_{[Y_t<m]}\frac{g(Y_t)}{Y_t}\right] \\ &\leq K_1(m)Q^x(\zeta > t) + K_2(m)Q^x\left[\frac{1}{Y_t}\right] \\ &= K_1(m)Q^x(\zeta > t) + \frac{K_2(m)}{x}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.39}$$

where the second line follows since $\frac{g(y)}{y}$ is bounded on (m,∞) by the linear growth assumption and g is continuous on $[0,m]$, and the third line is due to $\frac{1}{Y}$ being supermartingale since $1 - 1/x$ is a scale function for Y. Note that the above immediately yields (6.34).

Let us first show that w satisfies (6.35) when 0 is an accessible boundary under P^x. Indeed,

$$xw(s,x) = E^x[g(X_s)]$$

implies that $(s,x) \mapsto xw(s,x)$ is jointly continuous due to the Feller property of X and the continuity of paths[3]. Moreover, $g(0) = 0$ if 0 is an accessible (and, therefore, absorbing) boundary by our hypothesis. Thus, $\lim_{x\to 0} E^x[g(X_s)] = g(0) = 0$ and the convergence is uniform on compact intervals, yielding (6.35).

To show that w also satisfies (6.36) it suffices to show in view of (6.39) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Q^{x_n}(\zeta > t_n) = 0,$$

[3]Feller property implies in particular that $(P^x)_{x\geq 0}$ is a continuous family of laws.

which will hold if $Q^x(\zeta > t)$ tends to 0 as $x \to \infty$ for an arbitrary but fixed $t > 0$. Indeed, since $Q^x(\zeta > t)$ is decreasing in t, we have, for any monotone sequence $(t_n)_{n\geq 1}$ with limit s,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Q^{x_n}(\zeta > t_n) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} Q^{x_n}(\zeta > s \wedge t_1) = 0.$$

Motivated by the above define $w_0(t,x) := Q^x(\zeta > t)$ and pick $y > x$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q^x(\zeta > t) &= Q^x(\zeta > t, T_y < t) + Q^x(\zeta > t, T_y > t) \\ &= E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_{[T_y<t]} w_0(t - T_y, y)\right] + Q^x(T_y > t), \end{aligned}$$

by the strong Markov property of Y. Taking limits as $y \to \infty$ we obtain

$$Q^x(\zeta > t) = E^x\left[\mathbf{1}_{[\zeta<t]} \lim_{y\to\infty} w_0(t - T_y, y)\right] + Q^x(\zeta > t)$$

since $T_y \to \zeta$, Q^x-a.s. as $y \to \infty$. Observe that the interchange of expectation and limit is justified by (6.39). However, the above readily implies that $\lim_{y\to\infty} w_0(t - T_y, y) = 0$ on $[\zeta < t]$. Note that $T_y < \zeta$ and $w_0(s, y)$ is decreasing in s for fixed y. Thus, $w_0(t, y) \leq w_0(t - T_y, y)$ and we deduce that $\lim_{y\to\infty} w_0(t, y) = 0$ since $Q^x(\zeta < t) > 0$ for all $x > 0$.

Now, conversely assume that w is a classical solution of (6.32)-(6.33) satisfying (6.34)-(6.36). We shall show that w satisfies (6.37). First note that (6.36) implies w is bounded near infinity:

$$\sup_{y>x, s\in[r,t]} w(r, y) < \infty, \ \forall x > 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq r < t < \infty. \tag{6.40}$$

Next define $\tau_{n,m} := \inf\{t : Y_t \notin (\frac{1}{m}, n)\} = T_n \wedge T_{\frac{1}{m}}$, where Y is a weak solution of (4.24), and observe that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{m\to\infty} \tau_{n,m} = \zeta$, Q^x-a.s. for every $x > 0$. Fix a $T > 0$ and let $f(t, x) := w(T - t, x)$. Employing Ito's formula and using the continuity of σ and w_x we get

$$w(T,x) = Q^x\left[f(T \wedge \tau_{n,m}, Y_{T\wedge\tau_{n,m}})\right] = Q^x\left[\frac{g(Y_T)}{Y_T}\mathbf{1}_{[T<\tau_{n,m}]}\right] + Q^x\left[w(T - \tau_{n,m}, Y_{\tau_{n,m}})\mathbf{1}_{[T>\tau_{n,m}]}\right]$$

since $Q^x(T = \tau_{n,m}) = 0$.

Note that the first term of the summation converges to

$$Q^x\left[\frac{g(Y_T)}{Y_T}\mathbf{1}_{[T<\zeta]}\right]$$

by monotone convergence.

Let us first suppose that 0 is an accessible boundary for X. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q^x\left[w(T - \tau_{n,m}, Y_{\tau_{n,m}})\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\right] &= Q^x\left[w(T - T_{\frac{1}{m}}, \frac{1}{m})\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n>T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}\right] \\ &\quad + Q^x\left[w(T - T_n, n)\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n<T_{1/m}]}\right] \\ &\leq K(m)mQ^x\left(T_n > T_{\frac{1}{m}}\right) + Q^x\left[w(T - T_n, n)\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n<T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $K(m)$ is a constant satisfying $\lim_{m\to\infty} K(m) = 0$ due to (6.35). On the other hand,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} mQ^x\left(T_n > T_{\frac{1}{m}}\right) = m\frac{\frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{n}}{m - \frac{1}{n}} = 1.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} Q^x\left[w(T-\tau_{n,m},Y_{\tau_{n,m}})\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\right] \leq Q^x\left[w(T-T_n,n)\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,\infty}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n<T_0]}\right]$$

by the dominated convergence theorem. Recall that $T_0=\infty$ as Y does not hit 0. Thus,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{m\to\infty} Q^x\left[w(T-\tau_{n,m},Y_{\tau_{n,m}})\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\right] \leq Q^x\left[\lim_{n\to\infty} w(T-T_n,n)\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\zeta]}\right]$$

by the dominated convergence theorem in view of (6.40) and the fact that $T_n\to\zeta$, Q^x-a.s.. Moreover, $T-\tau_n$ is decreasing to $T-\zeta$ on the set $T\geq\zeta$. Thus, it follows from (6.36) that the above limit is 0 since $Q^x(\zeta=T)=0$. Hence,

$$w(t,x)=Q^x\left[\frac{g(Y_T)}{Y_T}\mathbf{1}_{[T<\zeta]}\right]$$

This completes the proof of uniqueness when 0 is an accessible boundary for X under P^x.

To complete the proof let us now assume that 0 is inaccessible, i.e. X is strictly positive. This means that $\frac{1}{Y}$ is a true martingale under Q^x in view of Proposition 4.5. The proof will be complete once we show again that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{m\to\infty} Q^x\left[w(T-\tau_{n,m},Y_{\tau_{n,m}})\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\right]=0.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^x\left[w(T-\tau_{n,m},Y_{\tau_{n,m}})\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\right] &= Q^x\left[w(T-T_{\frac{1}{m}},\frac{1}{m})\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n>T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}\right]\\
&\quad +Q^x\left[w(T-T_n,n)\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n<T_{1/m}]}\right]\\
&\leq KQ^x\left[\frac{1}{Y_{T_{\frac{1}{m}}}}\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n>T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}\right]\\
&\quad +Q^x\left[w(T-T_n,n)\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n<T_{1/m}]}\right]\\
&= KQ^x\left[\frac{1}{Y_T}\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n>T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}\right] \qquad (6.41)\\
&\quad +Q^x\left[w(T-T_n,n)\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n<T_{1/m}]}\right], \quad (6.42)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to (6.34) and the second equality is a consequence of the martingale property of $\frac{1}{Y}$.

Convergence of (6.42) to 0 as m and n diverge to ∞ can be shown as before. Thus, it remains to show that (6.41) converges to 0 as well.

Indeed, by the dominated convergence theorem

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} Q^x\left[\frac{1}{Y_T}\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n>T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}\right]=Q^x\left[\frac{1}{Y_T}\lim_{m\to\infty}\mathbf{1}_{[T\geq\tau_{n,m}]}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n>T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}\right]=0$$

for sufficiently large n since $\lim_{m\to\infty}\mathbf{1}_{[T_n>T_{\frac{1}{m}}]}=\mathbf{1}_{[T_n=\infty]}$ and $T^n<\infty$, Q^x-a.s. for any $n>x$ due to the fact that Y is strictly positive and explodes in finite time, Q^x-a.s. by Proposition 4.4. □

Remark 6.2. *In Theorem 6.2 both (6.35) and (6.36) are necessary. To see the necessity of (6.36) suppose that X is a strictly positive strict local martingale and $g(x) = x$. Then both 1 and $\frac{v(t,x)}{x}$ are the solutions of (6.32) with the initial condition (6.33). However, only $\frac{v(t,x)}{x}$ satisfy (6.36).*

On the other hand, if $g \equiv 1$ and X can reach 0 in finite time, both $1/x$ and $Q^x(\frac{1}{Y_t})$ satisfy (6.32)-(6.33). However, only the latter fulfils the condition in (6.35).

We end this section with the following immediate corollary to Theorem 6.2, which implies that the function $x \mapsto E^x[X_t]$ is of strictly sublinear growth at infinity for $t > 0$.

Corollary 6.1. *Suppose that σ satisfies (2.2) on $(0, \infty)$, (6.30) and Assumption 4.1. Let g be as in Theorem 6.2. Then for every $t > 0$*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{E^x[g(X_t)]}{x} = 0,$$

i.e. the function $x \mapsto E^x[g(X_t)]$ is of strictly sublinear growth at infinity.

7. Optimal stopping

In this section we will consider the following optimal stopping problem for a regular diffusion on (l, r) satisfying Assumption 2.1:

$$V(x) := \sup_{\tau\leq\zeta} E^x[e^{-\lambda\tau} g(X_\tau)], \tag{7.43}$$

where g is a nonnegative continuous function and the supremum is taken over all stopping times less than or equal to the lifetime of X. From a financial perspective V can be interpreted as the price of a perpetual American option with payoff g on a stock whose dynamics are governed by X and is currently priced at x while λ equals the constant interest rate.

Remark 7.1. *This problem has been considered by Cisse et al. in* [9]*, where the authors also use change of measure techniques. However, they make some implicit assumptions on their way towards a solution. For example, the proof of their key Lemma 3.5 is based on a result of Shiryaev, which requires the continuity of the function f (of their Lemma 3.5) in the one-point compactifaction of the state space by adding the cemetery state. This in particular requires the boundedness of g in 7.43 with a certain behaviour at the boundary points. Moreover, the Sturm-Liuoville equation on p.1251 that defines the excessive function $\phi^B(x) = E^x[e^{-qT_B}]$, where $T_B = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \notin (l, r)\}$ stipulates that $\phi(l+) = \phi(r-) = 1$. However, this immediately rules out the case when X has infinite lifetime as well as entrance boundaries. The method that is described below is applicable to all regular one-dimensional diffusions satisfying Assumption 2.1. Aside from these restrictions the method of Cisse et al. requires the knowledge of all ϕ^B for all open sets B, where T_B is the first exit time from B. As we shall see later, our solution only requires the λ-potential kernel, u^λ.*

To ease the exposition we shall assume from now on that X is on natural scale. We will solve the above problem using mainly the λ-potential kernel, u^λ, and the recurrent transform introduced in Proposition 3.2. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 7.1. *Let X be a regular diffusion satisfying Assumption 2.1 on (l,r), $y \in (l,r)$ be fixed, and g be a bounded continuous function. Then, for any stopping time, τ, and $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$E^x\left[e^{-\lambda\tau}g(X_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau\leq\zeta]}\right] = u^\lambda(x,y)E^{h,x}\left[\frac{g(X_\tau)}{u^\lambda(X_\tau,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{L^y_\tau}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}\right)\right], \tag{7.44}$$

where $E^{h,x}$ is the expectation with respect to $R^{h,x}$, which is the law of the recurrent transform in Proposition 3.2.

Proof. Since $u^\lambda(X_t,y)\exp\left(-\lambda t + \frac{s'(y)L^y_t}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}\right)$ is a bounded martingale when stopped at τ^y_{a-}, we obtain

$$u^\lambda(x,y)E^{h,x}\left[\frac{g(X_\tau)}{u^\lambda(X_\tau,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}L^y_\tau\right)\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_\tau\leq a]}\right] = E^x\left[e^{-\lambda\tau}g(X_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_\tau\leq a]}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau\leq\zeta]}\right].$$

Taking limits as $a\to\infty$ yields in view of monotone convergence theorem that

$$u^\lambda(x,y)E^{h,x}\left[\frac{g(X_\tau)}{u^\lambda(X_\tau,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}L^y_\tau\right)\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_\tau<\infty]}\right] = E^x\left[e^{-\lambda\tau}g(X_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_\tau\leq a]}\right]$$

since $P^x(L^y_\infty<\infty)=1$. However,

$$E^{h,x}\left[\frac{g(X_\tau)}{u^\lambda(X_\tau,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}L^y_\tau\right)\mathbf{1}_{[L^y_\tau<\infty]}\right] = E^{h,x}\left[\frac{g(X_\tau)}{u^\lambda(X_\tau,y)}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}L^y_\tau\right)\right].$$

□

Thus, the recurrent transform associated to u^λ removes the discounting in the optimal stopping making it more tractable. We shall apply one more transformation to get rid of the local time factor in order to make the problem one-dimensional again. However, this recurrent transform will already give us the necessary condition for the finiteness of the optimal stopping problem in (7.43) once we have the result from the next lemma. Throughout this section $E^{h,x}$ and $R^{h,x}$ will correspond to the expectation operator and the law associated to the solutions of (3.20), whose scale function can be chosen as follows for a given $y\in(l,r)$:

$$s_r(x) = \int_y^x \frac{1}{(u^\lambda(z,y))^2}dz. \tag{7.45}$$

Lemma 7.2. *For any $l<a<b<r$ and $x,y\in(a,b)$ we have*

$$E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_{[T_a<T_b]}\exp\left(-\frac{L^y_{T_a}}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}\right)\right] = \frac{R^{h,x}(T_a<T_b)s_a(b;x\wedge y)}{s_a(b;y)\left(1+s_a(b;y)s_r(b)^2u^\lambda(y,y)\right)}, \tag{7.46}$$

$$E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_{[T_b<T_a]}\exp\left(-\frac{L^y_{T_b}}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}\right)\right] = \frac{R^{h,x}(T_b<T_a)s_b(a;x\wedge y)}{s_b(a;y)\left(1+s_b(a;y)s_r(a)^2u^\lambda(y,y)\right)}, \tag{7.47}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R^{h,x}(T_a < T_b) &= \frac{s_r(b) - s_r(x)}{s_r(b) - s_r(a)}, \\ s_a(b;x) &:= \int_a^x \frac{s_r'(z)}{(s_r(b) - s_r(z))^2} dz, \qquad (7.48) \\ s_b(a;x) &:= 1 - \int_x^b \frac{s_r'(z)}{(s_r(z) - s_r(a))^2} dz \qquad (7.49) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Suppose $y > b$. Let us kill the recurrent transform as soon as it hits a or b and then apply an h-transform via

$$R^{h,x}(T_a < T_b) = \frac{s_r(b) - s_r(x)}{s_r(b) - s_r(a)}.$$

This h-transform conditions the diffusion to converge to a. Thus, if we denote the law of this h-transform by $R^{h,a,x}$ and its potential kernel by u_a (by dropping the dependence on b to ease the notation), then

$$\begin{aligned} E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_{[T_a<T_b]} \exp\left(-cL^y_{T_a}\right)\right] &= R^{h,x}(T_a < T_b) E^{h,a,x}\left[\exp\left(-cL^y_\infty\right)\right] \\ &= R^{h,x}(T_a < T_b) R^{h,a,x}(T_y < \infty) E^{h,a,y}\left[\exp\left(-cL^y_\infty\right)\right] \\ &= R^{h,x}(T_a < T_b) \frac{u_a(x,y)}{u_a(y,y)} \frac{\frac{s_a'(b;y)}{2u_a(y,y)}}{c + \frac{s_a'(b;y)}{2u_a(y,y)}} \end{aligned}$$

since L^y_∞ is exponentially distributed under $R^{h,a,y}$ with parameter $\frac{s_a'(b;y)}{2u_a(y,y)}$ and s_a is a scale function of the above h-transform.

Thus, $u_a(x,y) = s(b; x \wedge y)$ for $x, y \in (a,b)$, and we deduce

$$E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_{[T_a<T_b]} \exp\left(-\frac{L^y_{T_a}}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}\right)\right] = \frac{s_r(b) - s_r(x)}{s_r(b) - s_r(a)} \frac{s_a(b; x \wedge y)}{s_a(b;y)} \frac{1}{1 + s_a(b;y) s_r(b)^2 u^\lambda(y,y)}.$$

Similarly, whenever $x, y \in (a,b)$,

$$E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_{[T_b<T_a]} \exp\left(-\frac{L^y_{T_b}}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}\right)\right] = \frac{s_r(x) - s_r(a)}{s_r(b) - s_r(a)} \frac{s_b(a; x \wedge y)}{s_b(a;y)} \frac{1}{1 + s_b(a;y) s_r(a)^2 u^\lambda(y,y)}.$$

□

Proposition 7.1. *Let $x \in (l,r)$ be fixed and consider the value function, V, defined in (7.43). If $V(x)$ is finite, then*

$$-\liminf_{a \to l} \frac{g(a)}{u^\lambda(a,x) s_r(a)} \limsup_{b \to r} \frac{g(b)}{u^\lambda(b,x) s_r(b)} < \infty. \qquad (7.50)$$

Proof. Suppose that (7.50) is violated. Then, either $\liminf_{a\to l} \frac{g(a)}{u^\lambda(a,x)s_r(a)} = -\infty$ or $\limsup_{b\to r} \frac{g(b)}{u^\lambda(b,x)s_r(b)} = \infty$ or both. Suppose it is the former statement and, thus, there exists a sequnce (a_n) with $a_n \to l$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{g(a_n)}{u^\lambda(a_n,x) s_r(a_n)} = -\infty. \qquad (7.51)$$

Then, we claim that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E^x\left[e^{-\lambda T_n} g(X_{T_n})\right] = \infty,$$

where $T_n := T_{a_n} \wedge \zeta$, which is in contradiction with the hypothesis that $V(x) < \infty$.

Indeed, by Lemma 7.1 and taking $y = x$, we have

$$E^x\left[e^{-\lambda T_n}\left(g(X_{T_n}) \wedge M\right)\right] = u^\lambda(x,x) E^{h,x}\left[\frac{(g(X_\tau) \wedge M)}{u^\lambda(X_\tau, x)} \exp\left(-\frac{L^x_\tau}{2u^\lambda(x,x)}\right)\right]$$

for any $M > 0$. Letting $M \to \infty$ yields by virtue of the monotone convergence theorem

$$\begin{aligned} E^x\left[e^{-\lambda T_n} g(X_{T_n})\right] &= u^\lambda(x,x) E^{h,x}\left[\frac{g(X_{T_n})}{u^\lambda(X_{T_n}, x)} \exp\left(-\frac{L^x_{T_n}}{2u^\lambda(x,x)}\right)\right] \\ &= u^\lambda(x,x) \frac{g(a_n)}{u^\lambda(a_n, x)} E^{h,x}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{L^x_{T_{a_n}}}{2u^\lambda(x,x)}\right)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is due to the recurrence of X under $R^{h,x}$, i.e. $T_{a_n} \wedge \zeta = T_{a_n} < \infty$, $R^{h,x}$-a.s.. However, Lemma 7.2 now yields

$$E^x\left[e^{-\lambda T_n} g(X_{T_n})\right] = u^\lambda(x,x) \frac{g(a_n)}{u^\lambda(a_n, x)} \lim_{b\to r} \frac{1}{1 + s_{a_n}(b;x) s_r^2(b) u^\lambda(x,x)}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\lim_{b\to r} s_{a_n}(b;x) s_r^2(b) = \lim_{b\to r} \int_a^x \frac{s_r'(z) s_r^2(b)}{(s_r(b) - s_r(z))^2} dz = \int_a^x \lim_{b\to r} \frac{s_r'(z) s_r^2(b)}{(s_r(b) - s_r(z))^2} dz = -s_r(a)$$

by the dominated convergence theorem. Recall that, since $x = y$, and $s_r(x) = 0$ by (7.45). Hence, the claim follows from (7.51).

If, instead, $\limsup_{b\to r} \frac{g(b)}{u^\lambda(b,x) s_r(b)} = \infty$, a similar construction shows that $V(x) = \infty$ in that case, too.

To finish the proof note that scale functions are unique up to an affine transformation. Thus, the above conclusions are still valid if s_r is defined as in (7.45) with y as the lower limit of the integration. □

The above result shows that the boundedness of

$$z \mapsto \frac{g(z)}{u^\lambda(z,x)|s_r(z)|} \tag{7.52}$$

is necessary in order for $V(x)$ to be finite. In fact the condition (7.52) is independent of x and ensures $V(x) < \infty$ *for all* x, as one can also guess from the strong Markov property of X.

Lemma 7.3. *The mapping in (7.52) is bounded if and only for some* $y \in (l, r)$

$$z \mapsto \frac{g(z)}{u^\lambda(z,y)|s_r(z)|} \tag{7.53}$$

is bounded, where s_r *is defined by (7.45).*

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$\sup_a \frac{u^\lambda(a,x)}{u^\lambda(a,y)} < \infty.$$

Indeed, by the symmetry property of the potential kernels and (2.11)

$$\lim_{a\to l} \frac{u^\lambda(a,x)}{u^\lambda(a,y)} = \lim_{a\to l} \frac{u^\lambda(x,a)}{u^\lambda(y,a)} = \lim_{a\to l} \frac{E^x[e^{-\lambda T_a}]}{E^y[e^{-\lambda T_a}]}.$$

Moreover, if $x > y$, $E^x[e^{-\lambda T_a}] = E^y[e^{-\lambda T_a}]E^x[e^{-\lambda T_y}]$ by the strong Markov property. Thus, for $a < y < x$,

$$\lim_{a\to l} \frac{u^\lambda(a,x)}{u^\lambda(a,y)} = E^x[e^{-\lambda T_y}].$$

Similarly, for $a < x < y$,

$$\lim_{a\to l} \frac{u^\lambda(a,x)}{u^\lambda(a,y)} = \frac{1}{E^y[e^{-\lambda T_x}]}.$$

The strong Markov property can be used also to show

$$\lim_{a\to r} \frac{u^\lambda(a,x)}{u^\lambda(a,y)} < \infty,$$

concluding the proof. □

These results motivate the following assumption.

Assumption 7.1. *For some (thus, for all) $y \in (l,r)$ the mapping in (7.53) is bounded.*

The denominator in (7.53) should remind us of the transformation discussed in Section 5. Indeed, let us fix a $y \in (l,r)$ and remind ourselves that $(R^{h,x})_{x\in(l,r)}$ corresponds to the recurrent transform in (3.2) for $\alpha = \lambda$. Note that we can choose its scale function to be s_r that is defined in (7.45) and satisfies $s_r(y) = 0$. The following follows immediately from Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 7.1.

Proposition 7.2. *Suppose X is a regular diffusion on natural scale satisfying Assumption 2.1 and let $c = \frac{u^\lambda(y,y)}{2}$. Then*

(1) *For any $x \in (l,r)$ there exists a unique weak solution to*

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)dB_s + \int_0^t \left\{ \sigma^2(X_s)\frac{u^\lambda_x(X_s,y)}{u^\lambda(X_s,y)} - c\frac{s'(X_s)}{1-cs(X_s)}\mathbf{1}_{[X_s<y]} + c\frac{s'(X_s)}{1+cs(X_s)}\mathbf{1}_{[X_s\geq y]} \right\}, \quad t < \zeta, \tag{7.54}$$

where $\zeta := \inf\{t : X_{t-} \in \{l,r\}\}$.

(2) *The regular diffusion defined by (7.54) has scale function*

$$\tilde{s}(x) := \frac{1 + c(s_r(x) + |s_r(x)|)}{2(1 + c|s_r(x)|)}, \tag{7.55}$$

and speed measure

$$\tilde{m}(dx) = \frac{4(1+c|s_r(x)|)^2}{c\sigma^2(x)s_r'(x)}dx.$$

$\tilde{P}^x(X_\zeta = r) = \tilde{s}(x) = 1 - \tilde{P}^x(X_\zeta = l)$, where $\tilde{P}^x$ denotes the law of (5.26).

(3) *For any $F \in \mathcal{F}_t$ the following absolute continuity relationship holds.*

$$\tilde{P}^x(F, \zeta > t) = \frac{E^{h,x}\left[\mathbf{1}_F \left(1 + \frac{u^\lambda(y,y)}{2}|s_r(X_t)|\right) \exp\left(-\frac{L_t^y}{2u^\lambda(y,y)}\right)\right]}{1 + c|s_r(x)|}. \tag{7.56}$$

In particular, for any nonnegative continuous function, g, on (l, r) and stopping time, τ,

$$E^x\left[e^{-\lambda\tau} g(X_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau\leq\zeta]}\right] = \frac{u^\lambda(x,y)}{1 + c|s_r(x)|}\tilde{E}^x\left[\frac{g(X_\tau)}{u^\lambda(X_\tau, y)\left(1 + \frac{u^\lambda(y,y)}{2}|s_r(X_\tau)|\right)}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau\leq\zeta]}\right]. \tag{7.57}$$

The identity (7.57) together with Assumption 7.1 allows us to solve (7.43).

Theorem 7.1. *Let X be a regular diffusion on natural scale satisfying Assumption 2.1. Consider a nonnegative continuous function g on (l, r) satisfying Assumption 7.1. Let $\tilde{s}$ be as in (7.55) and G be the smallest concave majorant on $(\tilde{s}(l), \tilde{s}(r))$ of the function*

$$\hat{g}(x) := \frac{g(\tilde{s}^{-1}(x))}{u^\lambda(\tilde{s}^{-1}(x), y)\left(1 + \frac{u^\lambda(y,y)}{2}|s_r(\tilde{s}^{-1}(x))|\right)},$$

and define

$$\Gamma := \{x \in (\tilde{s}(l), \tilde{s}(r)) : \hat{g}(x) \geq G(x)\}.$$

Then, the optimal stopping time for (7.43) is

$$\tau^* := \inf\{t : \tilde{s}(X_t) \in \Gamma\} \wedge \zeta.$$

Moreover,

$$V(x) = \frac{u^\lambda(x,y)}{1 + \frac{u^\lambda(y,y)}{2}|s_r(x)|}G(\tilde{s}^{-1}(x)).$$

Proof. Note that G is well-defined due to Assumption 7.1. Let $Y = \tilde{s}(X)$ and observe that Y is a local martingale under $\tilde{P}^x$ and G is the least excessive majorant of $\hat{g}$ for Y. Therefore,

$$\sup_\tau \tilde{E}^x[\hat{g}(Y_\tau)] = G(\tilde{s}^{-1}(x)) = \tilde{E}^x[\hat{g}(Y_{\tau^*})]$$

by Theorem 3 on p. 127 of [28]. Thus,

$$\tilde{E}^x[\hat{g}(Y_{\tau^*})] \geq \tilde{E}^x[\hat{g}(Y_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau\leq\zeta]}]$$

by the nonnegativity of $\hat{g}$. This completes the proof in view of (7.57).

□

8. Conclusion

We have introduced a new class of path transformations for one-dimensional regular diffusions aimed at modifying their behaviour towards recurrence. As a first application these transformations are used to compute the distribution of the first exit time from an interval for any diffusion. These transforms turned out to be instrumental in understanding strict local martingales better as well. In Theorem 6.2 we give a novel characterisation of the Black-Scholes valuation formula in terms of the *unique* solution of an alternative Cauchy

problem when the stock price is a local martingale and thus resolve the longstanding issue with the absence of uniqueness for the solutions of the Black-Scholes equation. Finally, using the path transformations developed in this paper, we propose a unified framework for solving explicitly the optimal stopping problem for one-dimensional diffusions with discounting in Section 7.

References

[1] E. Bayraktar, C. Kardaras, and H. Xing, *Strict local martingale deflators and valuing american call-type options*, Finance and Stochastics, 16 (2012), pp. 275–291.

[2] ——, *Valuation equations for stochastic volatility models*, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, 3 (2012), pp. 351–373.

[3] E. Bayraktar and H. Xing, *On the uniqueness of classical solutions of cauchy problems*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 138 (2010), pp. 2061–2064.

[4] M. Beibel and H. R. Lerche, *Optimal stopping of regular diffusions under random discounting*, Theory of Probability & Its Applications, 45 (2001), pp. 547–557.

[5] J. Blanchet and J. Ruf, *A weak convergence criterion for constructing changes of measure*, Stochastic Models, 32 (2016), pp. 233–252.

[6] R. M. Blumenthal and R. K. Getoor, *Markov processes and potential theory*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 29, Academic Press, New York-London, 1968.

[7] A. N. Borodin and P. Salminen, *Handbook of Brownian motion—facts and formulae*, Probability and its Applications, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second ed., 2002.

[8] K. L. Chung and J. B. Walsh, *Markov processes, Brownian motion, and time symmetry*, vol. 249 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer, New York, second ed., 2005.

[9] M. Cissé, P. Patie, and E. Tanré, *Optimal stopping problems for some markov processes*, The Annals of applied probability, (2012), pp. 1243–1265.

[10] A. M. Cox and D. G. Hobson, *Local martingales, bubbles and option prices*, Finance and Stochastics, 9 (2005), pp. 477–492.

[11] S. Dayanik and I. Karatzas, *On the optimal stopping problem for one-dimensional diffusions*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 107 (2003), pp. 173–212.

[12] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing*, Mathematische annalen, 300 (1994), pp. 463–520.

[13] E. Dynkin, *Optimal choice of the stopping moment of a markov process*, in Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, vol. 150, 1963.

[14] E. Ekström and J. Tysk, *Bubbles, convexity and the black-scholes equation*, The Annals of Applied Probability, (2009), pp. 1369–1384.

[15] H. J. Engelbert and W. Schmidt, *Strong Markov continuous local martingales and solutions of one-dimensional stochastic differential equations. III*, Math. Nachr., 151 (1991), pp. 149–197.

[16] S. N. Evans and A. Hening, *Markov processes conditioned on their location at large exponential times*, Working paper.

[17] H. Föllmer, *The exit measure of a supermartingale*, Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete, 21 (1972), pp. 154–166.

[18] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe, *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, vol. 24, Elsevier, 2014.

[19] K. Itô and H. P. McKean, Jr., *Diffusion processes and their sample paths*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1974. Second printing, corrected, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 125.

[20] I. Karatzas and J. Ruf, *Distribution of the time to explosion for one-dimensional diffusions*, Probability Theory and Related Fields, 164 (2016), pp. 1027–1069.

[21] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, vol. 113 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, second ed., 1991.
[22] C. Kardaras, D. Kreher, and A. Nikeghbali, *Strict local martingales and bubbles*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 25 (2015), pp. 1827–1867.
[23] S. Kotani, *On a condition that one-dimensional diffusion processes are martingales*, in In Memoriam Paul-André Meyer: Séminaire de Probabilités XXXIX, M. Émery and M. Yor, eds., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 149–156.
[24] H. P. McKean, *Elementary solutions for certain parabolic partial differential equations*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 82 (1956), pp. 519–548.
[25] S. Pal and P. Protter, *Analysis of continuous strict local martingales via h-transforms*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 120 (2010), pp. 1424–1443.
[26] G. Peskir and A. Shiryaev, *Optimal stopping and free-boundary problems*, Springer, 2006.
[27] D. Revuz and M. Yor, *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, vol. 293 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third ed., 1999.
[28] A. N. Shiryaev, *Optimal stopping rules*, vol. 8, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
[29] D. W. Stroock and S. S. Varadhan, *Multidimensional diffusion processes*, Springer, 2007.

Department of Statistics, London School of Economics and Political Science, 10 Houghton st, London, WC2A 2AE, UK
E-mail address: u.cetin@lse.ac.uk